

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ALLIE TRUESDALE,

Plaintiff,

v.

ALBERT EINSTEIN HEALTHCARE  
NETWORK D/B/A EINSTEIN MEDICAL  
CENTER AND THOMAS JEFFERSON  
UNIVERSITY,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION  
NO. 22-1597

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this 29th day of January 2024, upon consideration of Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 30), Plaintiff’s Response in Opposition to Defendants’ Motion (Doc. No. 33), Defendants’ Reply (Doc. No. 38), and in accordance with the Opinion of the Court issued this day, it is **ORDERED** that Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 30) is **GRANTED** in part and **DENIED** in part as follows:

1. Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 30) is **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff’s claims of retaliation under the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”), Pennsylvania Human Relations Act (“PHRA”), and Philadelphia Fair Practices Ordinance (“PFPO”) in Counts One, Two, and Three of the Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 19).
2. Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 30) is **DENIED** as to Plaintiff’s disability discrimination claims under the ADA, PHRA, and PFPO in Counts One, Two, and Three of the Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 19).

3. Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 30) is **DENIED** as to Plaintiff's failure to accommodate claims under the ADA, PHRA, and PFPO in Counts One, Two, and Three of the Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 19).

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joel H. Slomsky, J.  
JOEL H. SLOMSKY, J.